



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*NP*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/633.132    08/04/00    BASCERI    C    M406 5.0139/

MM92/1010  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP  
2101 L STREET NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20037-1526

EXAMINER
----------

LEE, E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2815

DATE MAILED: 10/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/633,132

Applicant(s)

BASCERI, CEM

Examiner

Eugene Lee

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39,41-48,50-56 and 74-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 39,41-48,50-56 and 74-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 39, 41 thru 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laibowitz et al. '216 in view of Azuma et al. '363. Laibowitz discloses (see, for example, FIG. 7) a DRAM capacitor comprising a substrate (material layer) 12, whereupon a mesa (a first level and a second level, sidewall region) 51 and high dielectric film (high dielectric constant thin film material) 56 are formed. Laibowitz does not disclose doping of said BST high dielectric thin film material being such that the stoichiometry of said BST high dielectric thin film material is substantially uniform at least at said sidewall region. However, Azuma discloses (see, for example, column 6, lines 35-45) that doping with additional A or B-site-type element in an  $ABO_3$  dielectric, such as BST, of a DRAM capacitor will keep uniform the overall stoichiometric ratio. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to dope A or B elements in the high dielectric film of Laibowitz so that a uniform stoichiometry is maintained.

- a. Regarding the limitation of "a BST film", see column 2, lines 55-\* where Laibowitz discloses the use of barium titanate, strontium titanate and *its mixtures*.
- b. Regarding claim 44, Laibowitz in view of Azuma discloses the claimed invention except for a Ti percentage of about 50% to about 53.5% throughout

said BST high dielectric film. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to dope with Ti until this range is met, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

3. Claims 48, and 50 thru 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laibowitz et al. '216 in view of Azuma et al. '363 as applied to claims 39, 41 thru 47 above, and further in view of Leung et al. '762. Laibowitz in view of Azuma does not have a capping layer. However, Leung discloses that a capping layer may be formed to encapsulate a capacitor structure. See, for example, column 2, lines 27-56. Leung teaches that adding a capping layer protects the capacitor from diffusion and contamination. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a capping layer in the capacitor structure of Laibowitz in view Azuma so that the above-cited problems can be avoided.

4. Claims 74 thru 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosotani et al. '859 in view of Azuma et al. '363. Hosotani discloses (see, for example FIG. 7B and column 12, lines 31-44) a capacitor comprising a substrate 31, first electrode 32, dielectric film 34, and second electrode 35. Hosotani does not disclose doping said dielectric film such that the stoichiometry of said film is substantially uniform at least at said sidewall region. However, Azuma discloses (see, for example, column 6, lines 35-45) that doping with additional A or B-site-type element in a  $ABO_3$  dielectric of a DRAM capacitor will keep uniform the overall stoichiometric ratio. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2815

art at the time of invention to dope A or B elements in the high dielectric film of Hosotani so that a uniform stoichiometry is maintained.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/25/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the applicant's argument that Laibowitz in view of Azuma does not disclose the doping of the BST high dielectric thin film material such that the stoichiometry of said BST high dielectric thin film material is substantially uniform at least at said sidewall region, the Office respectfully disagrees as the doping of a film to maintain its stoichiometry is not divergent from making a film more uniform. The act of doping a material in order to maintain its stoichiometry or degree is the same limitation as making a film more uniform. The Webster's Dictionary states uniform as "having always the same form, manner, or degree : not varying or variable."

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2815

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### INFORMATION ON HOW TO CONTACT THE USPTO

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Lee whose telephone number is 703-305-5695. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on 703-308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Eugene Lee  
October 5, 2001



**EDDIE LEE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**